



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

5

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,051	12/21/2001	Daniel E. Knauss	088305-0143	5332
22428	7590	11/03/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/024,051	KNAUSS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/21/2001.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed December 21, 2001 with acknowledged provisional application filing date December 27, 2000 and I.D.S. filed December 21, 2001.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 15 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 810 from page 19 of specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 5557780).

Regarding independent claim 1, Edwards discloses a computer implemented method of automatically generating Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) documents or messages using an EDI system, comprising:

- receiving a source data model having a first EDI format corresponding to EDI related data, the source data model including metadata (col. 6, lines 60-64; col. 7, lines 23-47 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a “source data model” is received including an EDI format and “metadata”);
- mapping the metadata of the source data model to corresponding variables of a virtual document (col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-7, 48-61 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the “metadata” is mapped to the variables of a “virtual” document); and

- mapping the variables of the virtual document to metadata of a target data model having a second EDI format (col. 7, lines 15-21, 62-67; col. 8, lines 1-7 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the variables are mapped to the “metadata” of the target model with a second EDI format).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Edwards discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein:

- when a source message or document is inputted to the EDI system, the source message or document is translated to obtain its corresponding metadata, and the values corresponding to the metadata are provided to the corresponding mapped variables of the virtual document at run time (col. 6, lines 60-67; col. 7, lines 1-7; col. 8, lines 15-27; col. 9, lines 62-64 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a source document is inputted and translated to obtain its corresponding “metadata” and the values are provided to the corresponding mapped variables of the “virtual” document at run time); and
- the corresponding values of the mapped variables of the virtual document are provided to the corresponding metadata of the target data model, so as to populate the target data model with data from the source data model (col. 7, lines 15-21, 62-67; col. 8, lines 1-7 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the corresponding values of the mapped variables are provided to the corresponding “metadata” of the target data model to populate the target with data from the source).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Edwards discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein:

- the first EDI format is a data transaction formatting standard, and the second EDI format is a data transaction formatting standard (abstract – as demonstrated in the cited text, the EDI formats are data transaction formatting standards).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Edwards discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein:

- the variables of the virtual document are assigned semantic names representative of a type of data to be stored to the variables (Figure 4; col. 8, lines 15-27 – as demonstrated in the drawing and cited text, the variables of the “virtual” document are assigned names representative of their data type).

Regarding independent claim 5, Edwards discloses a system for automatically generating data in a self-describing markup language format from received EDI data, comprising:

- a receiving unit that receives a message or document from a first trading partner as EDI data (col. 6, lines 60-64; col. 7, lines 23-28 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a “receiving unit” receives a document from a “first trading partner” as EDI data);

- a virtual document that maps metadata from the message or document of the first trading partner to variables of the virtual document, and that maps metadata from a message or document of a second trading partner to the variables of the virtual document (col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 1-7, 48-67; col. 8, lines 1-7 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a “virtual” document maps “metadata” from the first document to variables of the “virtual” document and maps “metadata” from a document of a “second trading partner” to the variables of the “virtual” document); and
- a transmitting unit that transmits values provided to the variables of the virtual document from the message or document from the first trading partner, to the corresponding metadata of the message or document of the second trading partner (col. 7, lines 15-21, 62-67; col. 8, lines 1-7 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a “transmitting unit” transmits values provided to the variables of the “virtual” document from the first document to the corresponding “metadata” of the document of the “second trading partner”).

Regarding dependent claim 7, the claim reflects the system wherein the variables are assigned names as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 8 and 11, the claims reflect program code for performing the steps of the method as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 4 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 12 and 14, the claims reflect the system for generating data in a self-describing markup language from received EDI data as claimed in claims 5 and 7 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, the claim reflects a method for generating data from EDI documents as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 5557780) in view of Roberts et al. (U.S. Pub. No 20030135584).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Edwards does not disclose the self-describing markup language format is XML. Roberts teaches XML as a self-describing markup language (p.2, para. 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Edwards and Roberts before him at the time the invention was made, to modify using any EDI format as taught by Edwards (abstract) to include XML as the self-describing markup language as taught by Roberts, because XML provides a protocol where the type of data being used can be identified, as taught by Roberts (p.2, para. 35). It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because XML would allow variables to be named so that the names represented the type of data stored in the variables.

Regarding claims 9, 10 and 13, the claims reflect a self-describing markup language and XML as claimed in claim 6 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- System and method for event-driven data transformation (U.S. Patent 6795868),
- Representation and processing of EDI mapping templates (U.S. Patent 6418400),
- Method and apparatus for interfacing application system via the Internet (U.S. Pub. No. 20020091974).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-4124.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER